X-Fenes: Longitudinal Vacuum Modes Confined by 2D Crystals

Carlos Omeñaca Prado

December 2025

Abstract

We argue that any truly two-dimensional crystal — graphene, its group-IV analogues, pnictogen monolayers, hexagonal BN and transition-metal dichalcogenides — can be reinterpreted as a lumped element of a single physical medium: a frictionless etheric plasma Ψ. In this Quarkbase framework, the vacuum supports a longitudinal mode whose confinement and modulation by a given monolayer define an effective rigidity K_X, screening length λ_X and topology factor $f_{\mathrm{top},X}$.

We show that three directly measurable quantities — (i) the common resonance frequency $\omega_{\Psi,X}$ of simultaneous peaks in electrical and thermal conductivity, (ii) the ratio

$$R_X = \frac{\Delta\kappa/\kappa}{\Delta\sigma/\sigma}$$

at that resonance, and (iii) the linear strain coefficient $\kappa_{A,X}$ of the optical absorbance — are sufficient to reconstruct these effective Ψ-parameters for any "X-fene".

From basic dimensional and topological arguments we derive universal scaling laws: within each material family, the BKT-like coherence temperature of the Ψ-phase obeys

$$T_{c,X} \propto \omega_{\Psi,X}^2,$$

the conversion balance between Ψ-flux and heat or charge satisfies

$$R_X \sim \frac{\lambda_X^2}{L_X^2},$$

and $\kappa_{A,X}$ depends only on the 2D lattice topology, not on chemical species.

This allows us to view every 2D crystal as a section of a vacuum-wave transmission line with two controllable taps — an electric and a thermal channel — and to compose mosaics and stacks of X-fenes as bona fide Ψ-circuits.

We outline concrete spectroscopic and transport experiments capable of falsifying this picture, and propose a minimal roadmap for Ψ-engineering based on guided, focused and frequency-converted longitudinal vacuum modes in two-dimensional materials.

Contents

1 Core Concept: The Ψ-Field Interpretation of 2D Materials **4**
- 1.1 Introduction: From Anomalies in Graphene to a Unified Framework 4
- 1.2 The Ψ-Field and Its Role in 2D Coherence 4
- 1.3 The Definition of an X-fene 5

2 Classification of X-fenes and Their Ψ-Signatures **5**
- 2.1 The Four Families of X-fenes 5
  - 2.1.1 Family I: Carbo-fenes (C, Si, Ge, Sn, Pb) 5
  - 2.1.2 Family II: Pnicto-fenes (P, As, Sb, Bi) 6
  - 2.1.3 Family III: Hetero-fenes (BN, borophene, GaN, GaSe) 6
  - 2.1.4 Family IV: Ψ-Massive Fenes (MoS_2, WS_2, $NbSe_2$, etc.) 7
- 2.2 Consequence: X-fenes form a Unified Ψ-Phase Diagram 8

3 Universal Ψ-Scaling Laws **8**
- 3.1 Universal Law I: The T_c–ω_Ψ^2 Scaling (BKT–Ψ Coherence) 8
- 3.2 Universal Law II: The R_X Scaling — Who Converts Ψ-Flux to Heat or Charge? 9
- 3.3 Universal Law III: The Absorbance–Strain Law and Topological κ_A 10

4 X-fenes as Ψ-Circuit Elements **10**
- 4.1 The Vacuum-Wave Transmission Line Model 10
- 4.2 Category I Ψ-Components: Vacuum Waveguides 11
- 4.3 Category II Ψ-Components: Electric or Thermal Taps 11
- 4.4 Category III Ψ-Components: Ψ Lenses and Frequency Transformers 12
- 4.5 Category IV Ψ-Components: Coherent Ψ-Sources 12
- 4.6 Composition Rules for Ψ-Circuits 13

5 Experimental Programme and Falsifiability **13**
- 5.1 Experiment Set A: Simultaneous Resonances in $\sigma(\omega)$ and $\kappa(\omega)$ 13
- 5.2 Experiment Set B: T_c–ω_Ψ^2 Scaling Across Families 14
- 5.3 Experiment Set C: R_X Scaling and Penetration Depth λ_X 15
- 5.4 Experiment Set D: Absorbance–Strain Topology Test 15
- 5.5 Experiment Set E: Ψ-Wave Propagation Across Heterostructures 16
- 5.6 Experiment Set F: Coherent Ψ-Emission 16

6 Discussion and Implications for Ψ-Engineering **17**
- 6.1 The Shift of Paradigm: From Band Structures to Vacuum Structures 17
- 6.2 Why 2D Materials Are Special in Ψ-Physics 18
- 6.3 Technological Implications: Toward Ψ-Engineering 18
  - 6.3.1 1. Ψ-wave transport devices 18
  - 6.3.2 2. Ψ-energy converters 18
  - 6.3.3 3. Ψ-frequency shaping devices 18
- 6.4 Theoretical Implications: Connecting Quarkbase Cosmology with Condensed Matter 19
- 6.5 The Minimal Set of Claims that Would Survive Verification 19
- 6.6 What a Negative Result Would Mean 19
- 6.7 Why This Framework Is Experimentally Attractive 20

7 Conclusion, Outlook, and Final Abstract **20**

8 Conclusion: X-fenes as Windows into the Ψ-Field **20**

9 Outlook: Toward Ψ-Engineering **20**

10 Final conclusion **21**

Bibliography **21**

1 Core Concept: The Ψ-Field Interpretation of 2D Materials

1.1 Introduction: From Anomalies in Graphene to a Unified Framework

Two-dimensional materials display a set of experimental signatures that remain difficult to reconcile within standard condensed-matter theory. Graphene shows an unusual combination of extremely high thermal conductivity, quasi-ballistic electron transport, THz-range conductivity resonances, and strain-tunable optical absorbance that deviates from conventional Dirac-fermion expectations. Other 2D crystals — silicene, phosphorene, borophene, hexagonal BN, and transition-metal dichalcogenides — reproduce fragments of these anomalies in material-specific forms.

In the **Quarkbase Cosmology** framework, these phenomena are not independent quirks of the band structure. Instead, they arise from a single physical mechanism: **the interaction of 2D atomic lattices with a longitudinal mode of the vacuum, modeled as a frictionless etheric plasma Ψ.**

The central claim is:

> **A 2D material is not merely an electronic membrane but a boundary condition that shapes, confines, and couples to the vacuum's longitudinal field mode.**

This reinterpretation allows disparate observations to fall under one unified mechanism and extends naturally to a broader class of hypothetical materials, which we designate as **X-fenes**.

1.2 The Ψ-Field and Its Role in 2D Coherence

Within the Quarkbase framework, the vacuum is a compressible, non-dissipative medium described by Ψ. Electromagnetic fields emerge from gradients and curls of Ψ and of the effective electromagnetic potentials. The vacuum supports a **longitudinal mode**, in addition to the transverse electromagnetic waves of standard physics.

A 2D crystal interacts with this longitudinal mode in four essential ways:

1. **Cavity Formation.** The symmetry and spacing of its lattice produce a periodic set of "Ψ-cavities," which determine the allowed longitudinal modes.
2. **Phase Stiffness (K).** The ability of Ψ to maintain phase coherence across the plane is controlled by lattice rigidity and electron–vacuum coupling.
3. **Longitudinal Screening (λ).** The depth over which Ψ perturbations penetrate the material sets the balance between electrical and thermal responses.
4. **Resonant Frequency (ω_Ψ).** The primary Ψ-mode confined by the lattice appears experimentally as a **common resonance** in both electrical conductivity $\sigma(\omega)$ and thermal conductivity $\kappa(\omega)$, typically in the THz range.

This picture treats the 2D sheet **not as a passive substrate** but as an **active optical element** for the longitudinal vacuum mode.

1.3 The Definition of an X-fene

We define an **X-fene** as any two-dimensional atomic monolayer satisfying the following conditions:

1. **Ψ-Cavity Condition.** The lattice generates a periodic structure capable of confining longitudinal Ψ-field modes.

2. **Electronic Coupling Condition.** Electronic currents couple to Ψ through density ρ_e and current j_e, typically through effective terms of the form

$$g_1 \, \Psi \, \rho_e + g_2 \, (\nabla \Psi) \cdot j_e.$$

3. **Coherent Phase Condition.** The effective Ψ-free energy has a minimum at $|\Psi| \neq 0$ with non-zero phase stiffness K, enabling a Berezinskii–Kosterlitz–Thouless–like (BKT-Ψ) transition.

4. **Resonant Mode Condition.** There exists a longitudinal mode with frequency

$$\omega_\Psi \approx \frac{\pi c_\Psi}{L},$$

where L is the dominant cavity spacing (set by lattice constant or strain superperiod), and c_Ψ is the effective propagation speed in the confined geometry.

Graphene is the canonical **C-fene**. Silicene, phosphorene, borophene, and TMDC monolayers qualify as X-fenes to the extent that they satisfy these same four criteria.

2 Classification of X-fenes and Their Ψ-Signatures

2.1 The Four Families of X-fenes

Although dozens of 2D materials exist, they fall naturally into **four Ψ-structural families**, defined not by chemistry but by how they shape and guide the longitudinal Ψ-field mode.

2.1.1 Family I: Carbo-fenes (C, Si, Ge, Sn, Pb)

These are graphene and its group-IV analogues.

Ψ-characteristics.

- Nearly hexagonal cavities for Ψ with minimal distortion (best in graphene).
- High or moderate phase stiffness K.
- Good matching between electronic motion and Ψ-phase dynamics (especially for Dirac materials).
- Longitudinal screening λ moderately short, enabling balanced conversion between Ψ-flux and charge flow.

Ψ-predictions.

1. **BKT-like coherence temperatures decrease along the column**:

$$T_{c,C} > T_{c,Si} > T_{c,Ge} > T_{c,Sn} > T_{c,Pb}.$$

2. **Resonant Ψ frequency ω_Ψ decreases** as lattice buckling increases.

3. **Cross-resonant peaks in $\sigma(\omega)$ and $\kappa(\omega)$** appear in all carbo-fenes, with the same Lorentzian form but decreasing amplitude.

4. **Absorbance strain coefficient** κ_A should remain within 10^{-2}–10^{-3} per %, as cavity geometry remains hexagonal.

Interpretation. Graphene is the "gold standard" of Ψ-coherence in 2D: nearly perfect cavities, optimal K, and symmetric conversion between Ψ-energy and electrical/thermal channels.

2.1.2 Family II: Pnicto-fenes (P, As, Sb, Bi)

These include phosphorene, arsenene, antimonene, and bismuthene.

Ψ-characteristics.

- Strong lattice anisotropy → directional Ψ-cavities.
- Phase stiffness K highly anisotropic: $K_1 \gg K_2$.
- Multiple cavity lengths L_1, L_2 → **multiple resonant frequencies** $\omega_{\Psi,1}$, $\omega_{\Psi,2}$.

Ψ-predictions.

1. **Strongly anisotropic superconductivity (BKT-Ψ)**, with nearly lossless channels only along the high-K direction.

2. **Multiple THz peaks in $\sigma(\omega)$ and $\kappa(\omega)$** sharing the same frequencies but with different intensities.

3. **Absorbance response** $A(\varepsilon)$ splits into two independent coefficients:

$$\kappa_{A,\parallel} \neq \kappa_{A,\perp},$$

indicating a geometric origin of the Ψ-cavities.

Interpretation. Pnicto-fenes are natural **Ψ-waveguides**, concentrating vacuum flow along preferred directions with minimal dissipation and exposing multi-frequency Ψ-structure.

2.1.3 Family III: Hetero-fenes (BN, borophene, GaN, GaSe)

This category includes compounds with two atomic species in the unit cell.

Ψ-characteristics.

- Significant asymmetry in Ψ-cavity stiffness due to differing atomic radii and charges.
- Often wide-bandgap or insulating → decoupled from electronic background noise.
- Excellent for direct Ψ-optical testing.

Ψ-predictions.

1. **Absorbance-strain law**
$$A(\varepsilon) = A_0 [1 + \kappa_A \varepsilon]$$
becomes extremely clean and linear.
2. κ_A **is geometry-driven**, not chemistry-driven: BN and GaN with similar lattice topology must show similar κ_A despite different atomic composition.
3. Borophene may exhibit **extreme Ψ-hyperconductivity** in one axis and poor performance in the orthogonal.

Interpretation. Hetero-fenes are the **"purest probes of Ψ"** because their insulating nature isolates vacuum–lattice coupling from electrons.

2.1.4 Family IV: Ψ-Massive Fenes (MoS_2, WS_2, $NbSe_2$, etc.)

These are transition-metal dichalcogenides (TMDCs).

Ψ-characteristics.

- Heavy atoms → slow electronic dynamics → weak Ψ–electron coupling.
- Strong Ψ–phonon coupling → thermal channel dominates.
- Confinement of Ψ occurs but with lower effective c_Ψ.

Ψ-predictions.

1. **Resonance peaks primarily in** $\kappa(\omega)$, with $\sigma(\omega)$ showing only a faint echo.
2. The same resonant frequency must appear in both channels, confirming a common Ψ-origin.
3. BKT-Ψ coherence may emerge only under special doping regimes.

Interpretation. TMDCs behave as **Ψ–thermal converters**, absorbing longitudinal vacuum energy and releasing it primarily as heat.

2.2 Consequence: X-fenes form a Unified Ψ-Phase Diagram

Every X-fene is a point in a four-dimensional Ψ-space:

$$(K_X,\ c_{\Psi,X},\ \lambda_X,\ f_{\text{top},X}).$$

Experimental observables $(\omega_\Psi, R, \kappa_A)$ define these four coordinates. This allows the construction of a **universal phase diagram**, organizing 2D materials by their interaction with the vacuum field rather than by chemistry.

3 Universal Ψ-Scaling Laws

A central advantage of the Ψ-field description is that it provides **material-independent relations** between observable quantities. These scaling laws allow the same underlying physics to explain radically different 2D materials.

We now derive the three universal relations that define the "Ψ-engineered" behavior of X-fenes.

3.1 Universal Law I: The T_c–ω_Ψ^2 Scaling (BKT–Ψ Coherence)

In the Quarkbase framework, a 2D material enters a phase-coherent regime when the longitudinal vacuum mode achieves stable phase stiffness across the sheet. This produces a BKT-like transition characterized by the condition:

$$k_B T_{c,X} \sim \alpha_1 K_X.$$

However, K_X is not an independent variable. In any Ψ-confined cavity (created by the lattice), the stiffness scales as:

$$K_X \sim \frac{E_{\Psi,X}}{c_{\Psi,X}^2 L_X^2},$$

where:

- $E_{\Psi,X}$ is the vacuum energy density in the cavity,
- $c_{\Psi,X}$ is the velocity of the confined mode,
- L_X is the cavity spacing.

The resonant frequency is:

$$\omega_{\Psi,X} \sim \frac{\pi c_{\Psi,X}}{L_X}.$$

Eliminating L_X and $c_{\Psi,X}$, we obtain the key scaling:

$$T_{c,X} \propto \omega_{\Psi,X}^2.$$

Predictions.

1. Across each material family (carbo-fenes, pnicto-fenes, etc.), T_c **must scale quadratically with the Ψ-resonance frequency**.
2. Graphene, with the highest ω_Ψ, must sit at the top of the T_c ladder within the carbon group.
3. Materials with very low ω_Ψ (TMDCs) should have comparatively tiny or absent BKT-like superconducting regimes.

Experimental falsifier. If a 2D material shows a clear Ψ-resonance in $\sigma(\omega)$ or $\kappa(\omega)$, but T_c does *not* scale with ω_Ψ^2, the Ψ-framework is falsified.

3.2 Universal Law II: The R_X Scaling — Who Converts Ψ-Flux to Heat or Charge?

Define the resonance-sharpened conductivity jumps:

$$\Delta\sigma_X(\omega) = \sigma_X(\omega) - \sigma_{X,0}, \qquad \Delta\kappa_X(\omega) = \kappa_X(\omega) - \kappa_{X,0}.$$

Both share the same Lorentzian form because they originate from the **same** Ψ-susceptibility:

$$\chi_{\Psi,X}(\omega) = \frac{1}{1 - \omega^2/\omega_{\Psi,X}^2 \; + \; i\,\omega/\Gamma_X}.$$

But their *relative amplitudes* depend on how deeply the Ψ-field penetrates the material. Define the resonance amplitude ratio:

$$R_X = \frac{\Delta\kappa_X/\kappa_{X,0}}{\Delta\sigma_X/\sigma_{X,0}}.$$

In Quarkbase, the coupling strengths scale as:

- $g_{\sigma,X} \propto 1/\lambda_X \rightarrow$ strong electric coupling when Ψ is confined near the surface,
- $g_{\kappa,X} \propto \lambda_X \rightarrow$ strong thermal coupling when Ψ penetrates deeply into the lattice.

Thus:

$$R_X \sim \frac{\lambda_X^2}{L_X^2}.$$

Interpretation.

- $R_X \ll 1$: Strong charge coupling → electrical resonance dominates (hypothetical metallic X-fenes).
- $R_X \approx 1$: Balanced conversion → graphene-like behavior.
- $R_X \gg 1$: Strong thermal coupling → TMDC-like behavior.

Experimental falsifier. If $\sigma(\omega)$ and $\kappa(\omega)$ peaks appear at the same ω_Ψ but R_X does *not* correlate with penetration-depth measurements, the Ψ-field picture fails.

3.3 Universal Law III: The Absorbance–Strain Law and Topological κ_A

In standard electrodynamics, the universal absorbance of graphene $A_0 = \pi\alpha$ is considered a consequence of the Dirac cone and the fine structure constant. In Quarkbase, graphene's absorbance arises from **direct coupling between the transverse EM mode and the longitudinal Ψ-mode** confined in the 2D cavity.

For small strains ε, the cavity density changes according to:

$$\frac{\Delta n_{\text{cav}}}{n_{\text{cav}}} \approx \eta_X \, \varepsilon,$$

which directly affects optical absorbance:

$$A_X(\varepsilon) = A_{X,0} \, [1 + \kappa_{A,X} \, \varepsilon],$$

$$\kappa_{A,X} \sim \gamma \, \eta_X.$$

Here η_X depends **only** on lattice topology.

Predictions.

1. Materials with **identical lattice topology** (e.g., hexagonal C vs. hexagonal BN) must exhibit similar κ_A, even with different chemical composition.
2. Materials with **different topology** (e.g., graphene vs. phosphorene) must display different κ_A.
3. κ_A is *not* correlated with T_c or ω_Ψ; it isolates geometric influence.

Experimental falsifier. If κ_A clusters by chemistry rather than topology, the Ψ-cavity interpretation collapses.

4 X-fenes as Ψ-Circuit Elements

The universal laws derived in Part 3 reveal something deeper: **each 2D material behaves as a component of a vacuum-wave circuit.**

Unlike electronic circuits, these Ψ-circuits manipulate the longitudinal vacuum mode, allowing conversion, transport, and shaping of Ψ-energy across a mosaic of atomic layers.

This section formalizes the idea.

4.1 The Vacuum-Wave Transmission Line Model

Every X-fene behaves as a section of a transmission line for the Ψ-field, characterized by:

- **Ψ-Impedance**

$$Z_{\Psi,X} \sim \sqrt{\frac{K_X}{\rho_{\Psi,X} \, c_{\Psi,X}^2}},$$

encoding how easily the Ψ-phase propagates.

- **Electric Tap Conductance**
$$G_{\sigma,X} \propto g_{\sigma,X}^2,$$
measuring how strongly Ψ-flux is converted into charge flow.

- **Thermal Tap Conductance**
$$G_{\kappa,X} \propto g_{\kappa,X}^2,$$
measuring conversion into heat flow.

These are not independent: the ratio
$$\frac{G_{\kappa,X}}{G_{\sigma,X}}$$
is exactly the observable R_X from the resonance.

Thus, each material contributes:
$$\text{X-fene} \quad \Rightarrow \quad (Z_{\Psi,X},\, G_{\sigma,X},\, G_{\kappa,X}),$$
which fully specifies its role inside a Ψ-circuit.

4.2 Category I Ψ-Components: Vacuum Waveguides

Materials with:

- low $G_{\sigma,X}$,
- low $G_{\kappa,X}$,
- moderate or uniform $Z_{\Psi,X}$,

function as **nearly lossless Ψ-waveguides**.

Best candidates.

- h-BN,
- some TMDC monolayers in insulating regimes,
- borophene (only along its weak-conversion axis).

Implication. If a Ψ-excitation generated in graphene is injected into BN and reappears after several microns with nearly the same frequency ω_Ψ, then the BN layer is acting as a **vacuum-wave fiber**.

This is not electronic transport. This is transport of **longitudinal vacuum energy**.

4.3 Category II Ψ-Components: Electric or Thermal Taps

Materials with:

- low $\lambda \to$ strong electric coupling,
- high $\lambda \to$ strong thermal coupling,

act as controllable taps on the Ψ transmission line.

Electric taps ($\Psi \rightarrow$ charge). Hypothetical 2D metals or graphene patterned in specific ways ($R_X < 1$).

Balanced taps ($\Psi \rightarrow$ charge and heat). Graphene itself ($R_X \approx 1$).

Thermal taps ($\Psi \rightarrow$ heat). TMDC monolayers (MoS_2, WS_2, $NbSe_2$) ($R_X \gg 1$).

Function. A Ψ-circuit can distribute vacuum energy into:

- electrical channels,
- thermal channels,
- or let it continue as Ψ-wave.

This produces the first conceptual blueprint of a **Ψ-energy partition network** in 2D.

4.4 Category III Ψ-Components: Ψ Lenses and Frequency Transformers

Because ω_Ψ depends on cavity length L_X and effective velocity $c_{\Psi,X}$:

$$\omega_{\Psi,X} \sim \frac{\pi c_{\Psi,X}}{L_X},$$

a spatial gradient of L_X or $c_{\Psi,X}$ turns an X-fene mosaic into a **Ψ-index gradient**, analogous to graded-index optics.

Consequences.

- Regions with decreasing ω_Ψ act as **down-converters** of Ψ-excitations.
- Regions with increasing ω_Ψ act as **focusing or up-converting** elements.
- Mosaic structures enable **Ψ-lenses**, **Ψ-prisms**, and **Ψ-wave concentrators**.

Predictive signature. A Ψ-excitation should shift frequency, broaden, or concentrate spatially depending on the sequence of X-fenes it traverses.

This is not possible under purely electronic or phononic models.

4.5 Category IV Ψ-Components: Coherent Ψ-Sources

Any X-fene capable of sustaining a Ψ-BKT phase (nonzero K_X) becomes a **source of coherent Ψ-wave**, especially under:

- strain modulation,
- optical pumping,
- electronic injection.

Most promising materials.

- Graphene (the canonical Ψ-source),
- silicene,
- phosphorene (directional),
- selected TMDCs under strong bias.

These materials, when modulated at sub-THz or THz frequencies, should generate coherent Ψ-radiation — a direct experimental target.

4.6 Composition Rules for Ψ-Circuits

If each layer X is represented by:

$$\mathcal{X} = (Z_\Psi,\, G_\sigma,\, G_\kappa),$$

then a multilayer stack obeys simple composition rules:

1. **Series Composition (in-plane propagation)**: Impedances add, taps distribute energy at each segment.
2. **Parallel Composition (vertical stacks)**: Ψ-paths are split among materials, each with its own conversion channels.
3. **Mosaic Composition (in-plane heterostructures)**: Ψ-wavefronts refract, reflect, or focus depending on local gradients of Z_Ψ and ω_Ψ.

This allows engineering **Ψ-circuits** with functions analogous to electronics but built from 2D materials and acting on the vacuum itself.

5 Experimental Programme and Falsifiability

A theory that cannot be falsified is not physics. What follows is a **precise, minimal, experimental roadmap** that can confirm or contradict the Ψ-field interpretation of X-fenes.

Each test targets one of the universal scaling laws or circuit predictions described earlier.

5.1 Experiment Set A: Simultaneous Resonances in $\sigma(\omega)$ and $\kappa(\omega)$

Objective. Demonstrate that electrical conductivity $\sigma(\omega)$ and thermal conductivity $\kappa(\omega)$ share the **same resonant frequency** ω_Ψ, independent of material family.

Method.

1. Prepare suspended monolayers of selected X-fenes: graphene, silicene, phosphorene, BN, MoS_2.
2. Measure $\sigma(\omega)$ in the 1–60 THz range.
3. Measure $\kappa(\omega)$ in the same range using time-domain photothermal THz techniques.
4. Compare peak frequencies.

Ψ Prediction.

- Each material exhibits **one or more** coincident peaks in $\sigma(\omega)$ and $\kappa(\omega)$.
- The Lorentzian shape is identical; only amplitude differs.

Falsifier. If $\sigma(\omega)$ and $\kappa(\omega)$ peaks **do not coincide**, or if the κ peak is absent where σ shows a clear peak, Ψ-mode confinement is ruled out.

5.2 Experiment Set B: T_c–ω_Ψ^2 Scaling Across Families

Objective. Test the predicted quadratic scaling:

$$T_{c,X} \propto \omega_{\Psi,X}^2.$$

Method.

1. Determine T_c via:
   - BKT-like resistive transitions,
   - onset of coherent phase transport,
   - low-temperature anomalies in thermal conductivity.
2. Identify ω_Ψ from joint $\sigma(\omega)/\kappa(\omega)$ resonances.
3. Plot T_c vs. ω_Ψ^2 for each material family.

Ψ Prediction.

- Carbo-fenes produce a monotonic curve with graphene at the top.
- Pnicto-fenes produce branch curves reflecting anisotropy.
- TMDCs cluster near zero T_c because of low ω_Ψ.

Falsifier. If T_c and ω_Ψ^2 show **no correlation**, the Ψ-phase stiffness interpretation is invalid.

5.3 Experiment Set C: R_X Scaling and Penetration Depth λ_X

Objective. Confirm the relationship:

$$R_X = \frac{\Delta\kappa_X/\kappa_{X,0}}{\Delta\sigma_X/\sigma_{X,0}} \sim \frac{\lambda_X^2}{L_X^2}.$$

Method.

1. Extract R_X from resonant amplitudes.
2. Independently determine λ_X using:
   - scanning near-field optical microscopy (vacuum-mode penetration),
   - plasmon damping measurements,
   - tunneling or capacitance techniques.

Ψ Prediction.

- Graphene $\rightarrow R \approx 1$ (balanced conversion).
- BN, TMDCs $\rightarrow R \gg 1$ (dominant thermal coupling).
- Metallic monolayers $\rightarrow R \ll 1$ (dominant electric coupling).

Falsifier. If measured λ_X does not correlate with R_X, the conversion mechanism cannot be that of a confined Ψ-wave.

5.4 Experiment Set D: Absorbance–Strain Topology Test

Objective. Test whether the absorbance coefficient κ_A depends on **lattice topology rather than chemical species**.

Method.

1. Prepare monolayers with similar symmetry but different chemistry:
   - graphene vs. h-BN (hexagonal),
   - MoS_2 vs. WS_2 (trigonal prismatic),
   - phosphorene vs. arsenene (orthorhombic).
2. Apply uniaxial strain (0–2%).
3. Measure absorbance $A(\varepsilon)$ via UV–Vis or broadband IR.

Ψ Prediction.

$$A_X(\varepsilon) = A_{X,0}\Big(1 + \kappa_{A,X}\varepsilon\Big)$$

and

- $\kappa_A(\text{graphene}) \approx \kappa_A(\text{BN})$,
- $\kappa_A(\text{phosphorene}) \approx \kappa_A(\text{arsenene})$,
- $\kappa_A(\text{MoS}_2) \approx \kappa_A(\text{WS}_2)$,

because κ_A is set by cavity topology.

Falsifier. If κ_A clusters by chemistry (e.g., boron vs. carbon) instead of topology, the Ψ-cavity model fails.

5.5 Experiment Set E: Ψ-Wave Propagation Across Heterostructures

Objective. Show that Ψ-excitations propagate across different X-fenes in accordance with Ψ-circuit rules.

Method.

1. Construct lateral heterostructures:
   - graphene → BN → graphene,
   - graphene → MoS_2 → graphene,
   - phosphorene → BN → phosphorene.
2. Inject localized THz excitations into the first region.
3. Detect resonant signatures in the last region.

Ψ Prediction.

- BN should pass the Ψ-wave with minimal distortion (waveguide).
- MoS_2 should attenuate electric peaks but pass strong thermal peaks (thermal tap).
- A strong frequency shift across graded materials indicates Ψ-lensing.

Falsifier. If the resonant signature is lost or distorted in ways inconsistent with circuit composition rules, the model collapses.

5.6 Experiment Set F: Coherent Ψ-Emission

Objective. Test whether strained or optically driven X-fenes emit coherent longitudinal Ψ-waves.

Method.

1. Subject graphene or silicene to periodic strain modulation.
2. Perform pump–probe THz detection at the same modulation frequency.

Ψ Prediction. A coherent peak appears at ω_{mod}, with phase-locked enhancement in $\sigma(\omega)$ and $\kappa(\omega)$, showing that the layer is acting as a **Ψ-oscillator**.

Falsifier. If no coherent peak appears under any modulation condition, the hypothesis of Ψ-phase stiffness is weakened.

6 Discussion and Implications for Ψ-Engineering

The framework developed so far transforms 2D materials physics into something conceptually distinct: **a controllable interface between matter and the longitudinal degree of freedom of the vacuum.**

This section articulates the conceptual impact, technological consequences, and theoretical meaning of the results.

6.1 The Shift of Paradigm: From Band Structures to Vacuum Structures

Traditional solid-state physics interprets properties of 2D materials through:

- electron band structures,
- phonon spectra,
- symmetry groups,
- many-body interactions.

In contrast, the Quarkbase Ψ-picture attributes their most unusual phenomena to:

- the topology of Ψ-cavities generated by the lattice,
- the phase stiffness of the confined Ψ-mode,
- the conversion of Ψ-energy into electronic and thermal channels.

This view does not contradict band theory; it **absorbs** it as a low-energy limit of Ψ–matter coupling.

Key conceptual leap. Band structure determines how electrons respond. Ψ-cavity structure determines how the *vacuum* responds.

Electrical, thermal, and optical anomalies occur when both responses interfere.

6.2 Why 2D Materials Are Special in Ψ-Physics

The Ψ-field interacts with matter everywhere, yet the effects highlighted here become dominant only in monolayers.

The reason is geometric:

1. A single atomic layer constitutes a **hard boundary condition** for a field with longitudinal character.
2. The layer thickness is comparable to the natural coherence length imposed by the vacuum.
3. Cavities formed in the plane have stable resonances not washed out by three-dimensional scattering.
4. Electron motion is confined to the same plane as the Ψ-cavity, enabling perfect interference.

This explains why so many "mysterious" 2D behaviors appear simultaneously across materials with wildly different chemistry.

6.3 Technological Implications: Toward Ψ-Engineering

Viewing X-fenes as components of a vacuum-wave circuit allows a new design language.

Three classes of Ψ devices become possible:

6.3.1 1. Ψ-wave transport devices

- Vacuum-waveguides using BN or TMDC barriers.
- Ψ-delay lines and Ψ phase shifters.
- Domain-shaped Ψ-concentrators.

6.3.2 2. Ψ-energy converters

- Graphene-based $\Psi \rightarrow$ current converters.
- TMDC-based $\Psi \rightarrow$ heat converters.
- Directional $\Psi \rightarrow$ transport channels using phosphorene.

6.3.3 3. Ψ-frequency shaping devices

- Ψ-lenses, Ψ-prisms, Ψ-bandpass filters.
- Graded-index mosaics where ω_Ψ varies spatially.
- Structures for Ψ up-conversion and down-conversion.

None of these require exotic materials beyond current 2D fabrication; they only require reinterpretation.

6.4 Theoretical Implications: Connecting Quarkbase Cosmology with Condensed Matter

If the experimental programme validates the scaling laws and circuit behavior, then:

1. The Ψ-field is not merely a cosmological ontological claim; it becomes a **laboratory-accessible degree of freedom**.
2. Superconductivity, heat transport, and optical absorption acquire a common source in the vacuum's structure.
3. A unified description of force, energy, and information flow becomes feasible using Ψ rather than separate EM, thermal, and mechanical reservoirs.

This merges cosmology, electromagnetism, and materials science into a single consistent channel.

6.5 The Minimal Set of Claims that Would Survive Verification

A successful experimental confirmation would validate:

- The existence of a longitudinal vacuum mode interacting with 2D materials.
- Its resonant confinement by atomic lattices.
- Its conversion into electrical and thermal response under identical resonance.
- A BKT-like coherence transition governed by cavity-scale Ψ-phase stiffness.
- A geometric, not chemical, origin for strain-controlled absorbance.
- The interpretation of 2D materials as Ψ-circuit elements.

These constitute a full-fledged physical theory, not a phenomenological model.

6.6 What a Negative Result Would Mean

If experiments systematically fail to show:

- coincident σ/κ resonances,
- T_c–ω_Ψ^2 scaling,
- topology-controlled κ_A,
- R_X correlation with λ_X,

then Quarkbase's interpretation of X-fenes would be falsified.

This is a strength, not a weakness: a real theory must risk being wrong.

6.7 Why This Framework Is Experimentally Attractive

- Requires **no exotic new materials**.
- Uses **existing THz spectroscopy methods**.
- Works with **monolayers already fabricated at scale**.
- Produces **sharp, falsifiable predictions**.
- Provides **new technological pathways** even if Ψ is treated phenomenologically.

7 Conclusion, Outlook, and Final Abstract

8 Conclusion: X-fenes as Windows into the Ψ-Field

We have shown that two-dimensional materials—regardless of chemical composition—exhibit a coherent, falsifiable pattern when interpreted through the Quarkbase Ψ-framework. What unifies graphene, silicene, phosphorene, h-BN, borophene, and TMDC monolayers is not electronic structure but **vacuum structure**.

Each 2D lattice imposes boundary conditions on a **longitudinal mode of the vacuum**, thereby defining:

- a characteristic Ψ-resonance frequency $\omega_{\Psi,X}$,
- a coherence scale tied to a BKT-like transition temperature $T_{c,X}$,
- a conversion ratio R_X between electrical and thermal response,
- and a topology-governed strain absorbance coefficient $\kappa_{A,X}$.

These three experimentally accessible quantities—$\omega_{\Psi,X}$, R_X, $\kappa_{A,X}$—form a complete fingerprint for any **X-fene**, fully determining its function as a component of a **vacuum-wave circuit**.

Thus, the Ψ-field moves from cosmological speculation to a **laboratory-accessible physical degree of freedom**, with 2D materials serving as its waveguides, converters, lenses, and coherent sources.

Taken together, these results indicate that X-fenes provide an experimentally accessible platform for probing the structure of the vacuum.

9 Outlook: Toward Ψ-Engineering

If validated, this framework suggests a new technological domain based not on electrons or photons alone, but on the **controlled manipulation of vacuum modes**. Potential applications include:

- Ψ-wave circuitry integrated on 2D heterostructures,
- Ψ-based energy routing and conversion networks,

- devices leveraging anisotropic Ψ-flow for sensing or amplification,
- coherent Ψ-wave emission for probing fundamental physics.

The conceptual leap is conceptually straightforward but wide in scope:

2D materials are not surfaces of matter. They are **interfaces to the vacuum**.

10 Final conclusion

We propose a unified physical framework in which all two-dimensional crystals (graphene, silicene, phosphorene, h-BN, borophene, and transition-metal dichalcogenides) act as boundary conditions for a longitudinal mode of the vacuum described by the Ψ-field. A monolayer forms a resonant cavity for this mode, characterized by a phase stiffness K_X, a screening length λ_X, and a lattice-topology factor $f_{\text{top},X}$. We show that three measurable quantities—the joint electrical–thermal resonance frequency $\omega_{\Psi,X}$, the resonance amplitude ratio

$$R_X = (\Delta\kappa/\kappa)/(\Delta\sigma/\sigma),$$

and the strain absorbance coefficient $\kappa_{A,X}$—uniquely determine these Ψ-parameters for any "X-fene".

From this, we derive universal scaling laws: $T_{c,X} \propto \omega^2_{\Psi,X}$ within each material family; $R_X \sim \lambda_X^2/L_X^2$, predicting whether Ψ-flux converts preferentially into charge or heat; and $\kappa_{A,X}$ depends solely on lattice topology rather than chemistry.

These relations imply that all 2D materials are components of a **vacuum-wave circuit** with defined Ψ-impedance and electric/thermal taps. We outline a falsifiable experimental program using THz spectroscopy, strain-tuned optics, and heterostructure transport to test these predictions. If confirmed, X-fenes would constitute the first laboratory-accessible platform for engineering the vacuum itself.

Bibliography

References

[1] C. Omeñaca Prado, *Superconductivity and Thermal Hyperconductivity in Graphene from Quarkbase Cosmology*, Zenodo (2025).

[2] C. Omeñaca Prado, *Curvature-Tunable Absorbance in Graphene: A Quarkbase-Cosmology Prediction*, Zenodo (2025).

[3] C. Omeñaca Prado, *Simultaneous Enhancement of Electrical and Thermal Conductivity in Graphene through Excitation of the Etheric Longitudinal Mode*, Zenodo (2025).

[4] C. Omeñaca Prado, *Quantum Levitation – A Dual Interpretation from Standard Physics and Quarkbase Cosmology*, Zenodo (2025).

[5] C. Omeñaca Prado, *General Cosmology of Quarkbase (Neutrino)*, Zenodo (2025).

[6] C. Omeñaca Prado, *The Next Electromagnetic Revolution: Maxwell's Equations in the Framework of Quarkbase Cosmology*, Zenodo (2025).

[7] K. S. Novoselov *et al.*, *Electric Field Effect in Atomically Thin Carbon Films*, Science **306**, 666–669 (2004).

[8] A. K. Geim and K. S. Novoselov, *The Rise of Graphene*, Nature Materials **6**, 183–191 (2007).

[9] D. N. Basov, M. M. Fogler, and F. J. García de Abajo, *Polaritons in Van der Waals Materials*, Science **354**, aag1992 (2016).

[10] Z. Fei *et al.*, *Gate-Tuning of Graphene Plasmons Revealed by Infrared Nano-Imaging*, Nature **487**, 82–85 (2012).

[11] F. Wang and Y. Zhang, *Physics and Applications of 2D Materials*, Nature Reviews Physics **1**, 205–219 (2018).